

To appear in *Automated Data Analysis in Astronomy*, R. Gupta, H.P. Singh, C.A.L. Bailer-Jones (eds.), Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi, India, 2001

## Automated stellar classification for large surveys: a review of methods and results

Coryn A.L. Bailer-Jones

*Max-Planck-Institut für Astronomie, Königstuhl 17, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany*  
email: [calj@mpia-hd.mpg.de](mailto:calj@mpia-hd.mpg.de)

**Abstract.** Current and future large astronomical surveys will yield multiparameter databases on millions or even billions of objects. The scientific exploitation of these will require powerful, robust, and automated classification tools tailored to the specific survey. Partly motivated by this, the past five to ten years has seen a significant increase in the amount of work focused on automated classification and its application to astronomical data. In this article, I review this work and assess the current status of automated stellar classification, with particular regard to its potential application to large astronomical surveys. I examine both the strengths and weaknesses of the various techniques and how they have been applied to different classification and parametrization problems. I finish with a brief look at the developments still required in order to apply a stellar classifier to a large survey.

*Key words:* stellar classification, MK classification, physical parametrization, surveys, neural networks, probabilistic models, minimum distance methods, principal component analysis

### 1. Introduction

At its most general level, the objective of classification is to identify similarities and differences between objects, with the goal of efficiently reducing the number of types of objects one has to deal with. Ideally, the classes so produced are motivated by a scientific understanding of the objects. How we group the objects into classes depends on many things, including how many classes we want, what measurement features we have available and what procedure we use to discriminate between the objects. Of course, at some level of detail, all objects are unique, but the point is that different aspects of this uniqueness will be irrelevant in different classification contexts.

In the case of stellar astrophysics, a classification system has emerged over the 140 years since Lewis Rutherfurd first divided stars into three groups based on their low resolution optical spectra. While still closely tied to the optical spectra, stellar classification now reflects underlying physical properties, in particular the effective temperature,  $T_{\text{eff}}$ , surface gravity,  $\log g$ , and metallicity,  $[M/H]$ . Bright main sequence and giant branch stars can be represented well by the MK system (Morgan, Keenan & Kellman 1943), a two-parameter system in which the spectral type (SpT) is closely related to  $T_{\text{eff}}$ , and the luminosity class (LC) is related to  $\log g$ . This is a fairly coarse system, however, and many “peculiar” types of objects appear as exceptions which cannot be usefully described by these two parameters alone.

Physical stellar parameters (mass, age, radius, temperature etc.) show continuous distributions, so it is often more appropriate to parametrize spectra on continuous parameter scales rather than classify them into discrete classes. For example, the MK spectral types were originally designated as the classes which were discernible at a certain wavelength resolution, but we now know them to be somewhat arbitrary divisions on what is really an underlying continuous temperature scale. While I draw this distinction between classification and parametrization, I will nonetheless refer to the collective task of determining quantities from spectra as “classification” for brevity.

In this article, I give an overview of automated stellar classification as a tool for large surveys. “Large” here means in excess of one million objects. I start in section 2 with an overview of the goals of classification in this context, before going on to review the main classification methods (section 3) and give a critical comparison of these methods (section 4). I then give an overview of the literature which illustrates the application of these methods (section 5). After summarizing the current state of classification performance (section 6), I conclude with my view of how automated classification needs to develop to tackle the challenges posed by large surveys.

## 2. The goals of automated stellar classification

Recent technological developments in electronic detectors, but also in powerful computers and software, have meant that astronomical surveys of over  $10^9$  objects (e.g. the entire sky down to 20th magnitude) are now being designed and implemented. The full exploitation of the data from such surveys clearly requires automated methods. This is particularly the case for multiband surveys which will observe objects in many filters (or even with a low resolution spectrograph) and thus produce many measurements per object which cannot be summarized in one or two colour–magnitude diagrams.

A variety of large surveys are underway or being proposed, including multicolour surveys (e.g. 2MASS, DENIS and SDSS), the large-area synoptic survey and ambitious parallax missions such as FAME, DIVA and GAIA (see Clowes, Adamson & Bromage 2001 for an overview). Many of these are large area, magnitude-limited surveys, so even if their primary goal is not Galactic astrophysics, they will nonetheless observe large numbers of stars.

Large surveys are concerned with two things. The first is finding unusual objects. These will be discovered by virtue of being isolated from most objects in some parameter space (provided the measurement or classification system provides this separation). Once

detected, these unusual objects must always be analysed individually, no matter what classification system is used. The second goal of a survey is to do statistics with large numbers of objects, and for this purpose an automated classification system is required which can extract information relevant to the astrophysical goals. I therefore define the goal of automated stellar classification as *the reliable and precise determination of the intrinsic properties of a wide range of stars from their spectral energy distributions by predominantly non-interactive means*. That the classification should be precise (have low random errors) is self-evident. However, we must be aware that there are intrinsic limits to how precisely we can determine any idealized parameter, and that the “cost” of achieving ever higher precision increases rapidly (e.g. in terms of collecting area or integration time). “Reliable” refers to low systematic errors, implying a technique which will not give wild answers when it is unsure. For example, a stellar classifier should say that it does not know what a quasar is rather than just classify it as, say, a G2 star.

The fundamental intrinsic properties of a star are its mass, age and abundances. Related to these are its radius, effective temperature and surface gravity. There are also a number of “secondary parameters” for characterizing rotation, chromospheric and coronal activity, microturbulence etc. Many of these can only be measured (or rather inferred) in specific spectral ranges or at certain resolutions and signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs). Thus the design of an observational system depends on which parameters are to be measured. (Many of these quantities are not directly observable, so physical modelling plays an important role, for example in the determination of the mass of an isolated star.) There are other parameters which are extrinsic to the star, including its distance, kinematics, interstellar extinction and companionship. These may be of immediate interest, or may interfere with the determination of other parameters.

My above statement argues that an automated classification system should operate on a wide class of objects. Large surveys will not be of preselected objects. Thus a classification system which only operates on a small subset of stellar types will require that so much effort be put into a reliable preselection system that this system will already have done a significant part of the classification. Of course, one can imagine a hierarchical system with progressive stages of class detail, but, considered as a whole, this system still has to be applicable to a wide range of stellar types. Much of the early work on automated classification focused on a limited set of spectral types, and while this work was important for demonstrating the techniques, the classification systems produced cannot be directly implemented for larger surveys.

The final aspect of my defined goal refers to “predominantly non-interactive”. That classification for over one million objects based on tens of measurements per object cannot be done by hand is obvious, yet we must not delude ourselves into thinking that an automated system will never fail. There will always be cases with which the system will have problems, and the skill is to produce a system which will fail gracefully and inform us when difficulties arise (or better, quantify its own uncertainties). This is a challenge because even a system with a 99% correct classification rate will still make ten million errors on a data set of  $10^9$  objects.

This review only looks at existing classification systems, and hence at *supervised* classification methods. *Unsupervised* methods – which find “natural” groupings in a dataset without reference to externally specified classes – do not appear to be as useful for fulfilling the goal described. This is because the new classes they discover (or rather invent)

would still have to be calibrated and understood in terms of stellar astrophysics. It seems more sensible to me to use a supervised technique which will classify objects directly in terms of our physically motivated classes or parameters. Unsupervised techniques may, however, have a roll to play as a preprocessor in discriminating known objects from unknown ones.

In the rest of this paper I will frequently refer to the measured spectrum as the measured feature vector which is used as the basis for classification. However, this can equally well refer to a set of non-contiguous flux measurements obtained through a set of filters, and possible even contain other relevant measurements.

### 3. Classification methods

Almost all of the recent work on automated stellar classification has used one of four techniques: principal component analysis (PCA); neural networks (NN); minimum distance methods (MDM); Gaussian probabilistic models (GPM). PCA forms a set of linearly independent basis vectors with which to describe the data, and can be useful as a classification system by using only the most significant few components. PCA is described in the article by Singh, Bailer-Jones & Gupta in these proceedings. The neural networks used in automated stellar classification have almost exclusively been feedforward networks. These are networks which can be trained to give a mapping between the stellar spectral domain and the classification parameter domain. See the article by Bailer-Jones, Gupta & Singh in these proceedings for an introduction to these models. The other two methods are now described in more detail.

#### 3.1. Minimum distance methods (MDM)

Metric distance minimization (also called a minimum distance method) classifies objects by minimizing some distance metric between the object to classify and each member of a set of templates. The object is assigned the class of the template which gives the smallest distance (closest match). If  $\mathbf{X} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_N)$  is the feature vector (spectrum) to classify, and  $\mathbf{S}_c = (s_1^{\{c\}}, s_2^{\{c\}}, \dots, s_i^{\{c\}}, \dots, s_N^{\{c\}})$  is a template  $c$ , we evaluate

$$D_c = \frac{1}{N} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} w_i^{\{c\}} |x_i - s_i^{\{c\}}|^p \right]^{1/p} \quad (1)$$

where  $w_i^{\{c\}}$  is a weight assigned to flux element  $i$  of that class  $c$ .  $\mathbf{X}$  is assigned to class  $c$  for which  $D_c$  is minimum. The value of  $p$  determines the type of distance: typically  $p = 2$  is used, which is the normal Euclidean distance metric. With this approach, our highest class resolution is set by the grid of templates, i.e. we make a discrete classification equal to one of the templates. We can improve this by interpolating between the lowest few values of  $D_c$  and by making an inter-class assignment. Generally we must determine the weights according to the relative importance of spectral features for determining various classes. Taking  $w_i^{\{c\}} = 1$  for all  $i$  and  $c$  is generally a poor choice for stellar classification,

as it will attach most significance to the strongest lines, which are often not the most relevant for classification.

MDM can be considered as a specialization or generalization of a number of other methods. It is very similar to the “ $k$  nearest neighbours” (or  $k$ -nn) method, in which an object is assigned a class based on the classes of its  $k$  nearest neighbours in the feature space. (The feature space is the  $N$  dimensional space containing the measured feature vector.) MDM without class interpolation is the same as  $k$ -nn with  $k = 1$ . If inter-class assignments are meaningful, then the assigned class could be a weighted average of the classes of the  $k$  nearest neighbours, with the weights set inversely proportional to the distance to these neighbours. In MDM, the class templates are best formed from an average of a number of examples of a given class, while in the  $k$ -nn method this averaging is done specifically for each new object we want to classify.

MDM is the same as  $\chi^2$  minimization when  $p = 2$  and  $w_i^{\{c\}} = \sigma_i^{-2}$  (for all  $c$ ), where  $\sigma_i$  is the error in  $x_i$  (which includes the photon noise, calibration errors etc.) and the templates are assumed to be noise free. However, this is not the most useful weighting for stellar classification, as it is unrelated to the relative importance of the spectral features in distinguishing between classes. MDM is also similar to cross-correlation of  $\mathbf{X}$  on the templates, differing in the treatment of boundaries (i.e. how we treat the correlation sum when the spectra do not overlap fully).

### 3.2. Gaussian probabilistic models (GPM)

A different approach is to consider the classification problem in terms of probabilities. Let  $p(\mathbf{x}|c)$  be the probability that a member of class  $c$  has feature vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . From Bayes’ Theorem, the probability that an object with a measured feature vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is a member of class  $c$  is

$$p(c|\mathbf{x}) \propto p(\mathbf{x}|c)p(c) \quad . \quad (2)$$

We can then make the simplifying assumption that  $p(\mathbf{x}|c)$  is a multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean  $\mu$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ . These can be determined from a set of preclassified data by various methods (a process we can refer to as training).  $p(c)$  is the prior probability that an object is a member of class  $c$ . We may not have any idea what this is, so may want to assign an uninformative prior, i.e.  $p(c)$  constant. However, we may already have some knowledge that this object is more likely to be a particular type of star (e.g. that it is likely to be low metallicity based on its kinematics). All classification methods have such a prior, but not all allow us to specify it (easily). For example, MDM implicitly assumes that  $p(c)$  is constant.

This direct probabilistic approach to stellar classification has been explored relatively little in the context of stellar classification, yet a large literature exists on this class of model. For an example of an unsupervised approach for the classification of IRAS LRS sources, see Goebel et al. (1989). One feature of these models which may often be useful when data are missing (which is inevitable for large surveys) is the ability to *marginalize* over unmeasured features,  $\mathbf{x}_u$ , and classify only on the basis of the measured features,  $\mathbf{x}_m$ :

$$p(\mathbf{x}_m|c) = \int p(\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{x}_u|c) d\mathbf{x}_u = \int p(\mathbf{x}_m|\mathbf{x}_u, c) p(\mathbf{x}_u|c) d\mathbf{x}_u \quad . \quad (3)$$

Gaussian distributions are convenient here, because the marginal distribution of a multivariate Gaussian is another multivariate Gaussian.

## 4. A comparison of the classification methods

### 4.1. Training

All of the four methods described in the previous section are in some sense supervised, i.e. they assign classifications based on some preclassified data. NN and GPM must be explicitly trained, and encapsulate this training information in their internal parameters (the network weights and mean/covariance matrix respectively). With PCA, the training can be considered as the matrix diagonalization required to determine the principal components (PCs). PCA as it stands is not really a supervised classification method, as the formation of the PCs is independent of the class assignments. However, applications in the literature of PCA as a classifier generally then assumes that the classification is a simple function of the first few most significant PCs (the function being solved by simple regression/interpolation techniques).

### 4.2. Data requirements and speed

MDM does not have to be trained when weighting is not used, as the training data themselves are retained when making classifications. This introduces potentially serious problems when we wish to apply the method to multiparameter problems. If no interpolation between classes is used, then the training data should be “dense” in each parameter so that the method can recognise the effects of all parameters on the feature vector. Thus if we have templates for 30 spectral types, but then want to extend classification to 10 luminosity classes, we need another  $30 \times (10 - 1)$  training spectra so that every class combination is represented: the training data requirement increases exponentially with the number of parameters. Moreover, every time we want to classify a new object, we must evaluate  $D_c$  for every template. This will require a significant amount of computer time if several parameters are involved, and may be prohibitive for a large survey. We would probably want to be able to classify everything in the survey in about one day, because repeated classification is inevitable as the data or models are improved. This means each object must be classified within 0.1 milliseconds. Let us assume that the feature vector has 50 dimensions and that we wish to classify in five parameters. Of these, one (probably temperature) is represented by 30 different classes, and the other four by only ten classes each. The MDM training set would have to consist of  $30 \times 10^4$  training spectra, and each new classification would require 15 million calculations of the form  $(x - s)^2$  to be completed in 0.1 milliseconds. This is five times faster than is possible with a CRAY T90 supercomputer.

The logical solution to this problem is to reduce the amount of data by interpolation. This is possible with MDM through an interpolation in the class space, as mentioned in section 3.1. This, however, requires assumptions about the continuity and smoothness between neighbouring classes which may not be valid. Interpolation in the feature space, on the other hand, is more robust, as the features are typically photon fluxes. An interpolation in the feature space is precisely what neural networks do. If a 50:10:10:5 network could solve the above problem, it would require only about 700 products and 50 exponentials to be calculated per object. Furthermore, neural networks naturally lend themselves to being programmed in parallel, or even built into hardware in parallel, in which case the number of operations is reduced to about 70 products and three exponentials. This is easily achievable in 0.1 milliseconds. Additionally, the exponentiation (which is slow) could be done via a look-up table. Of course, neural networks must be trained. But as they only have to be trained once per classification run, and are trained on a much smaller amount of data than the entire survey, the training could be completed within one day. For example, a 560:5:10:3 network trained on a few thousand spectra for a similar problem to the example above took less than one day to train on a Sun Enterprise workstation, without any parallelization or look-up tables. GPM and PCA have similar speed characteristics as neural networks, i.e. they are relatively slow to train yet quick to apply. Note that any interpolation method (indeed any method with free parameters) requires that sufficient data be used for the proper determination of these parameters (see section 5.5 of Bailer-Jones et al. in these proceedings). As training data are generally “expensive” to acquire, it will be desirable to keep the model as simple as possible (although no simpler).

#### **4.3. Knowledge encapsulation**

A neural network encapsulates the information about the different classes in a single set of weights, yet all of these weights are involved in the classification of objects of any one class. This means that the presence of, say, B stars in the training data may affect the classification of, say, M stars. In an extreme case this is certainly true: if we train a network on 1000 B stars and only one M star, we would expect the network to learn very little about M stars and hence do poorly at classifying them. Thus we must pay attention to the relative frequencies of objects in the training data. For more evenly distributed training data we are faced with the conceptual problem of whether the nature of B stars should affect the ability of the network to classify M stars. In at least one case, a network trained on a large range of spectral types showed some internal specialization, i.e. certain hidden nodes specialized to recognise certain ranges of spectral types: see section 7 of Bailer-Jones et al. (these proceedings).

In MDM, the classification knowledge remains in the templates, all of which must be retained to make classifications. However, some additional information may be provided with an appropriate weight vector.

#### **4.4. Model complexity**

PCA is a linear transformation of the data, so any linear classification model which uses a fit to the first few PCs is likely to be too simplistic for multiparameter classification.

Neural networks, on the other hand, can be made arbitrarily nonlinear (in principle), and have a convenient means for investigating degrees of complexity and nonlinearity (through the use of different numbers of hidden nodes and with regularization techniques). Both GPM and MDM are nonlinear, by which I mean that the class is a nonlinear function of the feature vector. With MDM, the only apparent flexibility of the model with regard to complexity control (other than by increasing the amount of data) is the degree of sophistication in the class interpolation scheme. GPM models are limited by the fact that they assume Gaussian distributions, although this could be relaxed at the expense of computational effort.

Not all objects within a given class are identical, so it is necessary for a classification technique to realise that there are *intraclass* differences as well *interclass* ones. NN and GPM methods can be made to recognise this by being trained on several examples from each class. As mentioned previously, MDM templates could be constructed from several examples to convey intraclass variance, and with the  $k$ -nn variation, many templates may influence the classification, depending on the size of  $k$ .

#### 4.5. Missing data

An important issue is how the techniques deal with missing data. For instance, if just a few flux measurements are missing we do not want to have to throw away all of the data on the object (particularly if the absences are correlated with class). In PCA, incomplete spectra can be reconstructed through their projection onto the eigenvectors, and more effective reconstruction techniques are also possible (Connolly & Szalay 1999). With MDM, the distance metric can still be evaluated with missing dimensions, and similarly the multivariate Gaussians of GPM can have their dimensions reduced and still provide probabilities. With MDM, inputs being absent is equivalent to inputs which were never the present in the first place, because the different dimensions of the feature vector operate independently in determining the class. The situation is different with neural networks, because during training all of the inputs affect the determination of all of the weights. Thus, while a zero input will give no contribution to the output (provided the transfer functions are symmetric about zero), this itself may mean something, depending on what value that input had during training. For example, a zero input may mean a saturated absorption line. Hence, neural networks are not particularly robust to missing data, and the input vector should be “completed” in some way before being fed to the network.

#### 4.6. Interpretability

A final issue in comparing these models is their interpretability. MDM (and  $k$ -nn) must “win” as being the most obvious, although for the probabilistically minded GPM is at least as good. I would argue that neural networks are not nearly as obscure as people who have no experience with them often suppose: Far from being an elaborate “black box”, it is simply an example of a nonlinear regression algorithm. See section 7 of Bailer-Jones et al. (these proceedings).



## **5. A survey of the recent literature**

The following survey of the literature is not intended to examine every publication in this area. Instead it aims to illustrate how the above methods have been used and demonstrate the performance which has been achieved. My focus is primarily on recent work, specifically that done in the past five years. Although earlier work played a key role in the development and understanding of the techniques, and of automated classification itself, this work and their results have, to their credit, been superseded by more recent work.

I divide my survey into two main sections, MK classification and physical parametrization. This division is partly for convenience, but also reflects a broad difference in the approaches initially adopted by two communities. On the one hand, those interested in automating MK classification have tended to use neural networks. On the other hand, people more concerned with stellar atmospheres and physical parametrization have tended to use MDM. Moreover, the MK people tend to use the entire spectrum, whereas the stellar atmospheres people often (but not exclusively) make use of certain line ratios and equivalent widths which are believed to have enhanced sensitivity to physical conditions. Furthermore, members of the latter community have not stressed the “automated” side of their work, presumably as this was not their main concern. The emphasis on automation from the MK community probably reflects the need to computerize the traditional MK classification method of comparing spectra with standards by eye. Techniques which use the overall appearance of a spectrum will be more robust to changes in resolution and SNR than ones which use certain equivalent widths, because below some resolution, equivalent widths are no longer measurable and classification becomes impossible. A method using “raw” spectral information, on the other hand, will get less confident (higher random errors) as the SNR or resolution degrade, but should still be able to produce a classification. Similarly, a whole spectrum approach will generally be more robust to missing data.

MK classification and physical parametrization are complementary approaches. MK classifications are fixed, while physical parametrizations will evolve as stellar models improve. MK gives a compact, and hence necessarily approximate, description of a stellar spectrum. However, as the goal is to determine the physical parameters of stars, some kind of physical calibration is ultimately necessary. With automated methods it is now completely feasible to redetermine physical parameters directly from the *original* data every time a new physical model is introduced, even for large surveys. I see no problem with this approach: on the contrary, we should always be prepared to improve our knowledge of objects as our physical understanding grows, rather being restrained by a static classification system. After all, there can be no better standard system than the underlying physics!

The performance of automated classification models is invariably assessed from some error measure based on the residuals (the differences between the model classifications and the “true” classifications), using some evaluation data set. (The ability of the model to *generalize* what it has learned cannot be assessed using the training data.) A number of different error measures are used in the literature, so results cannot always be easily compared. The RMS value of the residuals,  $\sigma_{RMS}$ , is widely used. However, it is a

conservative measure in that it is dominated by the outliers, and not necessarily representative of the majority of the residuals. The mean absolute value of the residuals,  $\epsilon$ , is more robust: because it uses only the first power of the residuals, it is usually smaller than  $\sigma_{RMS}$ . For a Gaussian distribution,  $1\sigma = 1.25\epsilon$ . Another error measure which gives a more appropriate representation of the distribution is  $\sigma_{68}$ , the value of the residuals which contains the central 68% of the residuals. It is motivated by the fact that it is equal to the standard deviation ( $\sigma$ ) of a Gaussian distribution (which in turn is equal to the RMS for Gaussian distributed data). All of these errors are, of course, just a summary of the results for all classes, and obscure any variation of the error with class. For example,  $\log g$  is typically harder to determine for cool stars than for hot stars.

Note that authors rarely state the SNR they have used, although it is invariably high ( $>100$ ). Only a few articles have analysed how performance varies with SNR. This is an important assessment for magnitude limited surveys, because these will have the majority of their objects at the lowest SNR.

### 5.1. MK classification

PCA received early attention as a component of an automated classifier. Whitney (1983) used PCA to reduce the 47 spectral bins of 53 A and F stars measured over 3500–4000Å to just the three most significant principal components. A nonlinear fit to these enabled him to determine spectral types to within 1.6 SpT (RMS error). This was no worse than a fit using all 47 principal components, indicating how much redundant information was present in these spectra. In comparing this to other data compressions with PCA, one should realise that A and F stars over this relatively narrow spectral range will show much less variation than, say, O–M stars over a wider spectral range, so fewer PCs will be required for a good reconstruction in the former case.

Weaver & Torres-Dodgen (1997) used a neural network to classify spectra simultaneously in terms of spectral type and luminosity class, for a range of spectral types (O–M) and luminosity classes (I–V). This was based on high SNR 15Å resolution spectra in the range 5800–8900Å which the authors had previously used for A star classification (Torres-Dodgen & Weaver 1995). They used a hierarchical system of networks: A single network first does coarse spectral type classification. Depending on the outcome, the spectrum is then passed to one of several more specialist networks, each of which only knows about (i.e. was trained on) a subset of classes, e.g. just A stars or just F stars. With such a system, the mean absolute errors,  $\epsilon$ , were 0.56 SpT and 0.27 LCs (varying with spectral type between 0.4 and 0.8 SpT, and 0.2 and 0.4 LC). This compares to 1.26 SpT and 0.38 LC for the coarse classifier alone, so is quite a significant increase in accuracy for spectral type. It occurs because each specialist network is faced with a simpler problem than the coarse network. It would be interesting to test whether a single, more complex, network could achieve a performance similar to a hierarchical approach. Note that the system is only hierarchical in spectral type, presumably explaining why the luminosity class accuracy improved less. Making the structure hierarchical in all parameters would involve a lot of networks, each of which could only be trained on a fraction of the training data. As training data is always limited, there is a limit to how specialized the network structure can be, because each network requires sufficient data to

ensure that the network weights are not underdetermined (see Bailer-Jones et al., these proceedings).

Bailer-Jones, Irwin & von Hippel (1998a) used a neural network to classify O–M spectra of luminosity classes III, IV and V, using 3Å resolution spectra in the range 3500–5200Å. Over 5000 spectra were used, half for training and half for testing. They used PCA to compress these 820 dimension spectra down to 25 network inputs, and demonstrated that this compression removed noise. The spectral type and luminosity class problems were solved separately. A committee of ten 25:5:5:1 networks for the spectral type problem was used. (A committee is a system in which several identical networks are trained from different initial random weights, and the classification results are averaged.) The mean classification error was  $\sigma_{68} = 0.82$  SpT (ranging between 0.3 and 1.0 depending on spectral type) and  $\sigma_{RMS} = 1.09$  SpT.

For the luminosity class problem Bailer-Jones et al. (1998a) used a committee of ten 25:5:5:3 networks in probabilistic mode, in which each output represents the probability that the spectrum is a member of each class. This achieved correct classifications for 93% of class III stars (giants) and 98% for class V (dwarfs). Results for class IV were poor (only about 10% correct) which is worse than a random classifier! In this case, the network is conveying the useful information that class IV is not distinct (at least in these spectra), which is not implausible. Equally good results were obtained on both the luminosity class and spectral type problems using only the line information (using the continuum removal method of Bailer-Jones, von Hippel & Irwin 1998b). Interestingly, very similar performance was also obtained for both the spectral type and luminosity class problems when using the entire spectrum, indicating that the PCA compression by a factor of 33 led to no loss of classification information (Bailer-Jones 1996). MDM was also applied to the complete spectra for the spectral type problem, with templates formed from the average of many training examples. Although the results were poorer ( $\sigma_{RMS} = 2.03$  SpT), only  $\chi^2$  weighting was used, and class interpolation was not (introducing a discretization error of up to 0.5 SpT), so a direct comparison is not fair (Bailer-Jones 1996).

Singh, Gulati & Gupta (1998) used neural networks with PCA compression to determine spectral types of O–M stars from 11Å resolution spectra in the range 3500–6800Å. A number of networks with different numbers of hidden nodes and PCA inputs were tested. The best was given by a 20:64:64:55 network used in probabilistic mode, trained on 55 library spectra, and produced a classification error on 158 test spectra of  $\sigma_{RMS} = 2.2$  SpT. The article by Singh et al. (these proceedings) shows details of the PCA compression of these data, and compares it with the data from Bailer-Jones et al. (1998a).

Christlieb et al. (1998) used GPM to classify A5–K0 stars into one of eight classes. The feature vector was a set of 10 line strengths measured from optical spectra from the Hamburg/ESO objective prism survey. The model was trained using the EM (expectation maximization) algorithm on 671 spectra and tested on the same data using the leave-one-out-method (i.e. 670 separate models are trained on each combination of 670 spectra, and the performance evaluated on the one left out). The overall misclassification rate was 28%, but only 1% of objects were incorrectly classified by more than one class.

The above examples concern classification in visual blue and red spectra, but work has also shown that MK classification is possible in the ultraviolet. Vieira & Pons (1995)

used extinction-corrected IUE spectra (1150–3200Å) at 2Å sampling in a neural network classifier, and could achieve an RMS accuracy of 1.1 SpT for spectral types O3 to G5. Almost identical results were obtained with an unweighted MDM classifier.

## 5.2. Physical parametrization

Vansevicus & Bridzcius (1994) used MDM with  $\chi^2$  weighting to determine spectral type and absolute magnitude,  $M_V$ , from six colour indices defined from Vilnius photometry. RMS accuracies of 0.7 SpT and 0.8 mag respectively for O5–M5 stars with  $-9 < M_V < +12$  were obtained. They further attempted to determine colour excess  $[(B-V)-(B-V)_0]$  from the value of the reduced  $\chi^2$  (evaluated from  $D_c$  in equation 1), based on the belief that this should equal 1.0 for no reddening. While an intriguing idea, this assumption appears to ignore the existence of intraclass variation.

Bailer-Jones et al. (1997) used a neural network to physically calibrate spectra in terms of effective temperature,  $T_{\text{eff}}$ . They calculated a grid of synthetic spectra for a range of effective temperatures and surface gravities, and processed them to have the same properties (wavelength sampling and flux scale) as the observed spectra (those used in Bailer-Jones et al. 1998a). An 820:5:5:1 neural network was trained on these synthetic spectra, so that when the real spectra were applied, effective temperatures were determined directly. As these real spectra had known spectral types, it was also possible to derive an accurate  $T_{\text{eff}}$ –SpT calibration for giants, subgiants and dwarfs. They further showed that the calibration was metallicity dependent, indicating  $[M/H] = -0.2$  for the sample. Gulati, Gupta & Rao (1997) independently used the same approach to calibrate G and K dwarf stars from 4850–5380Å spectra at a resolution of 2.4Å. Their spectra had already been assigned  $T_{\text{eff}}$  by other means, and they showed that the network could reproduce these to  $\pm 250$  K. This is an upper limit, set by the sampling of  $T_{\text{eff}}$  in the synthetic spectral grid. An MDM method with no weighting was similarly grid limited.

Katz et al. (1998) used MDM with  $\chi^2$  weighting to determine  $T_{\text{eff}}$ ,  $\log g$  and  $[Fe/H]$  of high resolution (0.1Å) echelle spectra over the range 3900–6800Å. The templates were synthetic spectra calculated with temperatures between 4000 K and 6300 K,  $\log g$  between 0.6 and 4.7 dex and metallicities between  $-2.9$  and  $+0.35$  dex. With a SNR of 100, the RMS errors were  $\log T_{\text{eff}} = 0.008$ ,  $\log g = 0.28$ , and  $[Fe/H] = 0.16$ . If the SNR was degraded to 10, the errors were no worse ( $\log T_{\text{eff}} = 0.009$ ,  $\log g = 0.29$ , and  $[Fe/H] = 0.17$ ). (For reference, an error of  $\sigma$  in log co-ordinates is a fractional error of  $2.3\sigma\%$  in linear co-ordinates.)

Bailer-Jones (2000) used a neural network approach to determine all three principal stellar parameters over a wide parameter range ( $T_{\text{eff}} = 4000$ – $30000$  K,  $\log g = 2.0$ – $5.0$ ,  $[M/H] = -3.0$  to  $+1.0$ ) working only with synthetic spectra (3000–10000Å). The 3000 synthetic spectra were randomly split into two sets, the network trained on one and its performance tested on the other. The goal was to investigate the effect of SNR and resolution on the ability to determine the parameters. The surprising result was that even at low resolution (FWHM of 50–100Å) and SNR (5–10 per resolution element),  $T_{\text{eff}}$  and  $[M/H]$  could be determined to 1% and 0.2 dex respectively, and  $\log g$  to 0.2 dex for stars earlier than solar (mean absolute errors), using a 35:5:10:3 network. The spectra retained absolute flux information, because the simulations were done for the GAIA

parallax mission. This certainly helps the  $T_{\text{eff}}$  determination (as  $L = 4\pi R^2 \sigma T_{\text{eff}}^4$ ), but the network still has to disentangle the influences of the three parameters on the spectra. The work also tested a number of proposed GAIA filter systems.

Again in the context of simulating performance for a parallax mission (this time DIVA), Elsner et al. (1999) used an unweighted MDM method to determine  $T_{\text{eff}}$  and  $\log g$  from low resolution synthetic spectra (varying from 160–380 Å FWHM over the range 3130–9990 Å). Simulating objects at  $V = 12$ , they obtained RMS errors of 0.5 dex in  $\log g$  and 10% in  $T_{\text{eff}}$  for hot stars, and 0.15 dex and 5% respectively for cool stars. With the assumed design for DIVA, this precision (or better) would apply to about 2.5 million stars.

Snider et al. (2001) applied neural networks to the physical parametrization of 264 observed spectra with  $T_{\text{eff}} < 6500$  K. These were observed at 2 Å resolution over the range 3630–4890 Å. The data were initially calibrated by physical methods, and a subset used for training a network with 1952:5:3 architecture. The RMS errors were 3% in  $T_{\text{eff}}$ , 0.27 dex in  $\log g$  and 0.22 dex in  $[M/H]$ . These results are comparable to those obtained by Katz et al., but using a smaller wavelength coverage and much lower resolution.

Allende Prieto & Lambert (2000) have developed a method for estimating masses and ages from Hipparcos data using evolutionary models. The Hipparcos parallax, fluxes and B–V colour enable a determination of the effective temperature and radius of the star (once a suitable bolometric correction is applied). The position of the star in the theoretical HR diagram is then compared to theoretical evolutionary tracks for objects of different masses. By averaging over all possible tracks which lie within the error box of the object, an estimate of the mass and age (with uncertainties) is obtained. The method was tested against objects with known parameters from eclipsing spectroscopic binaries, with RMS errors of 12% in mass, 6% in radius and 4% in  $T_{\text{eff}}$ . A better mass determination (8% error) is possible if the metallicity of the objects is known (assumed near-solar in this case). When combined, these errors correspond to an error in  $\log g$  of about 0.06 dex. This is considerably lower than that obtained by other methods, and indicates that evolutionary models could be useful in constraining the possible surface gravities. However, it should be pointed out that the  $\log g$  of the sample only varied between 3.7 and 4.5 dex.

### 5.3. Other issues

Interstellar extinction (reddening) will affect any deep survey, and it is important to ensure that it does not bias determinations of stellar parameters. One approach to circumvent this is to determine the degree of extinction from the spectra, with the aim of correcting for it. Gulati, Gupta & Singh (1997) attempted such a determination with both a neural network and  $\chi^2$  weighted MDM, using the interstellar absorption feature at 2200 Å. From 6 Å resolution spectra they were able to determine  $E(B-V)$  to within 0.08 magnitudes (RMS error) over the range 0.05–0.95 magnitudes. At least some of this error is the discretization error in the template/training spectra, which had  $E(B-V)$  in steps of 0.05 magnitudes.

Another important issue related to classification is the fact that many stellar systems are binaries, and – as most will not be resolvable – will have composite spectra. Whenever

the brightness ratio is not extreme, it is in principle possible to determine the parameters of both components. Weaver (2000) has attempted to do this with a neural network which has two sets of outputs, one for each component. The network had an additional output for determining the brightness ratio. Composite spectra were artificially constructed by combining the spectra of Weaver & Torres-Dodgen (1997). Mean absolute classification errors for both components of 2.5 SpT and 0.45 LC could be obtained, although this average masks a large dependence on brightness ratio. As the brightness ratio increased from 1 to 20, the errors varied from about 1.7 to 7 SpT, and 0.2 to 1.0 LC. Some improvement was obtained with a hierarchical system (i.e. using networks specialized in classifying, say, only A–F, or G–K binaries). The network included recurrent feedbacks from the output layer to the input, with the justification that this improved the results, but it was not clear why this should be the case. Note that the network assumed all spectra to be binaries, so assigns two classes to all spectra, even if it is not composite. Clearly, with this approach, some kind of preprocessor is necessary to determine which spectra really are binary.

## 6. Summary of the current status of automated classification

I will now summarise where we are in terms of our ability to classify stars automatically in line with the goal given in section 2.

1. All three physical parameters ( $T_{\text{eff}}$ ,  $\log g$ ,  $[M/H]$ ) can be determined to reasonable accuracy from spectra in an automated fashion.
2. We need neither high resolution spectra nor high signal-to-noise data. A resolution of around 100Å FWHM and SNR of about 10 per resolution element appear to be sufficient, although a relatively large wavelength coverage (several thousand Å) may then be necessary. Such a wide coverage may well be desirable for many surveys anyway, and presents no particular technical problem if obtained photometrically.
3. Relatively simple classification models are sufficient, for example neural networks with one or two hidden layers each with 5–10 hidden nodes or MDM with simple weighting schemes.
4. For a wide range of stars (O–M, I–V), spectral types can be determined to 0.3–0.8 SpT and luminosity classes to 0.2–0.4 LC (or 95% correct classification rate).
5. Physical parameters can be determined directly from spectra by training neural networks on synthetic spectra (for example).  $T_{\text{eff}}$  and  $[M/H]$  can be obtained with relative ease to 1% and 0.2 dex respectively across a wide parameter range.  $\log g$  can be determined to about 0.2 dex for early type stars, but only 0.5 dex for later-type stars.
6. Parallax information is very useful, as it enables a determination of absolute luminosity and hence radius. Thus it is particularly important that powerful automated stellar classification systems are developed for parallax missions such as DIVA, FAME and GAIA.
7. We can make some attempt to estimate the fundamental parameters of age and mass through the combination of evolutionary models and classification models.
8. Some object identification (discrimination of stars from other objects), binary classification and interstellar extinction determination is possible.

## **7. Future requirements**

I hope to have shown that many of the constituents of a survey classification system have been demonstrated. However, much work remains to be done to develop and implement a complete system, and I finish this review by highlighting what further developments are required.

To date, all applications have used “cleaned” data sets of preselected objects. This will not be the case for a blind survey, and a robust system for identifying which objects are stellar is essential. Methods which have been demonstrated include neural networks for star–galaxy separation based on image data (e.g. Odewahn et al. 1993) and the recognition of non-stellar objects from the projection of spectra onto stellar principal components (Bailer-Jones et al. 1998a).

Stellar spectra show much more variation than is represented by the three parameters  $T_{\text{eff}}$ ,  $\log g$  and  $[M/H]$ . Thus classifiers need an extended parameter space to include factors such as microturbulence and the  $\alpha$  abundance ratios. Similarly, different phases of evolution, such as pre-main-sequence stars and white dwarfs, as well as peculiar stars and pulsating stars, need to be catered for, as do extensions to ultra cool objects (L and T dwarfs). Developments in stellar structure and atmospheric models are required to model real spectra better, for example to take account of non-LTE effects, chromospheres and the formation of dust at low temperatures. Many such developments are in progress or could already be incorporated.

Large data sets will inevitably have missing data, and classifiers must be able to cope with this in a robust way. Some theoretical discussion was given in section 4, but there has been little empirical evaluation of this problem. Additionally, the classification system should be able to assess its own uncertainties when making classifications (whether inputs are complete or not), and not just rely on global statistical estimates from test data. For example, with a neural network, uncertainties will generally be higher where the training data are sparse, and methods exist for quantifying these (e.g. MacKay 1995). Local error measures appear to be easily obtainable in both the MDM and GPM methods.

Finally, I mention the need for the automated classification system to be designed in parallel with the survey. Just as the classification system must be able to cope with what can be measured, and not make unrealistic demands, the survey must provide the data which are required by the classification system for producing reliable classifications. The products of large surveys will be of a more statistical nature than has previously been the case, so greater interplay between classifier and survey development is essential.

This review has focused on just four methods, yet they are essentially the only methods which have been used in automated stellar classification. Each method has its own advantages and disadvantages, and it is not my intention to point to a “winner”, particularly as GPM has not seen much application to stellar classification, further optimization is desirable with MDM, and entirely distinct methods exist which have not even been tested. Indeed, the exploration of fully alternative approaches is of much interest. But generally speaking, for multidimensional problems, it appears that some kind of interpolation method is appropriate, rather than a look-up table type approach. Also, as both the variety of spectra encountered and the number of parameters we wish to determine increase, a limited hierarchical approach may be useful.

I would like to acknowledge the following people for useful conversations at various times over the past few years: Norbert Christlieb, Chris Corbally, Bob Garrison, Richard Gray, Gerry Gilmore, Mike Irwin, Ofer Lahav, Michael Storrie-Lombardi and Ted von Hippel.

## References

- Allende Prieto, C., Lambert, D.L., 1999, *A&A*, 352, 555  
Bailer-Jones, C.A.L., 1996, PhD thesis, Univ. Cambridge  
Bailer-Jones, C.A.L., 2000, *A&A*, 357, 197  
Bailer-Jones, C.A.L., Irwin, M., Gilmore, G., von Hippel T., 1997, *MNRAS*, 292, 157  
Bailer-Jones, C.A.L., Irwin, M., von Hippel T., 1998a, *MNRAS*, 298, 361  
Bailer-Jones, C.A.L., Irwin, M., von Hippel T., 1998b, *MNRAS*, 298, 1061  
Christlieb, N., Grasshoff, G., Nelk, A., Schlemminger, A., Wisotzki, L., 1998, in *Classification, Data Analysis and Data Highways*, I. Balderjahn et al. (eds.), Springer: Berlin, p. 16  
Clowes, R., Adamson, A., Bromage, G., 2001, *The New Era of Wide-Field Astronomy*, ASP Conf. Ser., Astronomical Society of the Pacific: San Francisco, to appear  
Connolly, A.J., Szalay A.S., 1999, *ApJ*, 117, 2052  
Elsner, B., Bastian U., Liubertas, R., Scholz, R., *Baltic Astronomy*, 8, 385  
Goebel, J., Volk, K., Walker, H., Gerbault, F., Cheeseman, P., Self, M., Stutz, J., Taylor, W., 1989, *A&A*, 222, L5  
Gulati, R.K., Gupta R., Rao, N.K., 1997, *A&A*, 322, 933  
Gulati, R.K., Gupta R., Singh, H.P., *PASP* 109, 843  
Katz, D., Soubiran, C., Cayrel, R., Adda, M., Cautain, R., 1998, *A&A*, 338, 151  
MacKay, D.J.C., 1995, *Network: Computation in Neural Systems*, 6, 469  
Morgan, W.W., Keenan, P.C., Kellman, E., 1943, *An Atlas of Stellar Spectra with an Outline of Spectral Classification*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago  
Odewahn, S.C., Humphreys, R.M., Aldering, G., Thurmes, P., 1993, *PASP*, 105, 1354  
Singh, H.P., Gulati, R.K., Gupta, R., 1998, *MNRAS*, 295, 312  
Snider, S., Qu, Y., Allende Prieto, C., von Hippel, T., Beers, T.C., Sneden, C., Lambert, D.L., Rossi, S., 2001, *ASP Conf. Ser.*, 223, CD-1344  
Vancevicius, V., Bridzius, A., 1994, *Baltic Astronomy*, 3, 193  
Vieira, E.F., Pons O.D., 1995, *A&AS*, 111, 393  
Weaver, W.B., 2000, *ApJ*, 541, 298  
Weaver, W.B., Torres-Dodgen, A.V., 1995, *ApJ*, 446, 300  
Weaver, W.B., Torres-Dodgen, A.V., 1997, *ApJ*, 487, 312  
Whitney, C.A., 19832, *A&AS*, 51, 443